

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/600,571	06/23/2003	Masao Hori	HARA-072-046	9645
20374 KUROVCIK A	7590 10/30/2007 & KUBOVCIK		EXAM	INER
SUITE 710			NGUYEN, TU MINH	
900 17TH STF WASHINGTO			ART UNIT PAPER NUMB 3748	PAPER NUMBER
	.,		3748	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			10/30/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

••,		•	(
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/600,571	HORI ET AL.	į
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Tu M. Nguyen	3748	
The MAILING DATE of this communication Period for Reply	appears on the cover sheet	with the correspondence address	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RI WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILIN - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CI after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communicatio - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory p - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by any reply received by the Office later than three months after the earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	G DATE OF THIS COMMUNER 1.136(a). In no event, however, may n. eriod will apply and will expire SIX (6) Mistatute, cause the application to become	IICATION. a reply be timely filed ONTHS from the mailing date of this communicat ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on	17 October 2007.		
	This action is non-final.		
3) Since this application is in condition for all closed in accordance with the practice und	owance except for formal ma	·	is
Disposition of Claims			
4) ⊠ Claim(s) 17-25 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are with 5) □ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ⊠ Claim(s) 17-25 is/are rejected. 7) □ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) □ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and s	ndrawn from consideration.		
Application Papers			
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Exa	miner.		
10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on 23 June 2003 is/ar	e: a)⊠ accepted or b)⊡ ob	jected to by the Examiner.	
Applicant may not request that any objection to	- · · ·		
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the control of the control	·	* ' '	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for for a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority docur 2. Certified copies of the priority docur 3. Copies of the certified copies of the application from the International Bu	ments have been received. ments have been received in priority documents have bee ureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	Application No. <u>08/875,577</u> . en received in this National Stage	
* See the attached detailed Office action for a	a list of the certified copies no	ot received.	
Attachment(s)	_		
 Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-94) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 	B) Paper N	v Summary (PTO-413) o(s)/Mail Date f Informal Patent Application	

DETAILED ACTION

1. An Applicant's Request for Continued Examination (RCE) and an Applicant's Amendment filed on October 17, 2007 have been entered. Claims 1-4, 7, 8, and 11-16 have been canceled. Claims 17-25 have been added and are pending in this application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office Action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 3. Claims 17-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Katoh et al. (U.S. Patent 5,402,641) in view Ozawa et al. (U.S. Patent 5,075,276).

Re claim 17, as illustrated in Figures 1 and 5, Katoh et al. disclose a process for purifying exhaust gas from lean burning internal combustion engines by using an exhaust gas purifying-use catalyst (6) containing a noble metal (platinum) and a transition metal (copper) (see line 61 of column 3 to line 3 of column 4),

the catalyst being obtained by mixing the noble metal and the transition metal with or carrying the noble metal and the transition metal by a fire-resistant inorganic oxide, the fire-resistant inorganic oxide being active alumina (line 62 of column 3),

Art Unit: 3748

the engine being a type that burns a hydrocarbon fuel and being adapted to operate between a first exhaust gas state and a second exhaust gas state, depending on changes in air-fuel ratio (see at least lines 3-8 of the Abstract),

the exhaust gas entering the first exhaust gas state (stoichiometric or rich air-fuel ratio) at an air-fuel ratio of 13 to 15, an exhaust-gas temperature being in a range of 350°C to 800°C at an inlet of the catalyst in the first exhaust gas state (step 106 with YES answer and step 108) (in step 108, the first exhaust gas state is stoichiometric with an air-fuel ratio of 14.7),

the exhaust gas entering the second exhaust gas state (lean air-fuel ratios) at an air-fuel ratio of more than 15 to 50 (see lines 25-26 of column 5), an exhaust-gas temperature being in a range of 200°C to 500°C at the inlet of the catalyst in the second exhaust gas state (step 106 with NO answer and step 110).

Katoh et al., however, fail to disclose that their engine is a gasoline fuel-direct-injection type engine which allows fuel to be directly injected inside a cylinder of the engine; and that an amount of the noble metal being in a range of 0.01 to 50 g/liter with respect to the catalyst volume, the fire-resistant inorganic oxide having a BET surface area of 50 m²/g to 200 m²/g and having a pore diameter of 10 nm to 30 nm.

Katch et al. disclose the claimed invention except for applying the invention to a gasoline fuel-direct-injection type engine. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply the invention of Katch et al. to a gasoline fuel-direct-injection type engine, since the recitation of such amounts to an intended use statement.

Note that a gasoline fuel-direct-injection engine also generates exhaust gases containing harmful

Art Unit: 3748

emissions of HC, NOx, soot, CO, and SOx, that require purification before the gases can be released to the atmosphere; and the mere selection of the purification process of Katoh et al. for use in a gasoline fuel-direct-injection engine would be well within the level of ordinary skill in the art.

Ozawa et al. disclose a catalyst adapted to purify hydrocarbons, carbon monoxide, and NOx in the exhaust gas of an internal combustion engine. As indicated on lines 15-62 of column 6, Ozawa et al. teach that their catalyst comprises a catalytically active coating having a platinum metal group and a high surface area support material. The platinum metal group is in a density range of 0.01 to 5 g/liter of the catalyst volume (see line 57 of column 6). The high surface area support material is a fire-resistant inorganic oxide (gamma alumina) having a BET surface area of 50 m²/g to 200 m²/g and having a pore diameter of 10 nm to 30 nm (300 angstrom = 30 nm) (see lines 16-20 of column 6). As depicted in Figure 2, Ozawa et al. further teach that their catalyst has relatively high purification efficiencies of HC, CO, and NOx based on said composition of the catalyst. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made, to have utilized the density range of platinum and the inorganic oxide taught by Ozawa et al. in the catalyst of Katoh et al., since the use thereof would have provided a catalyst having high efficiencies in removing HC, CO, and NOx emissions in the exhaust gas.

Re claim 18, in the modified process of Katoh et al., the exhaust gas varies between the first exhaust gas state (stoichiometric or rich air-fuel ratio) and the second exhaust gas state (lean air-fuel ratio) that forms a more oxidizing, low-temperature atmosphere as compared with the first exhaust gas state, depending on changes in air-fuel ratio.

Art Unit: 3748

Re claim 19, in the modified process of Katoh et al., the first exhaust-gas state (stoichiometric or rich air-fuel ratio) is a state at a time of high output of the gasoline engine of a fuel-direct-injection type, and the second exhaust-gas state (lean air-fuel ratio) is a state at a time of low output of the gasoline engine (see at least Figure 13 and lines 24-41 of column 10).

Re claim 20, in the modified process of Katoh et al., the exhaust gas is purified by removing hydrocarbon, carbon monoxide and nitrogen oxides from the exhaust gas by the use of the catalyst.

Re claim 21, in the modified process of Katoh et al., the transition metal (copper) is at least one selected from the group consisting of manganese, iron, cobalt, copper, and nickel.

Re claim 22, in the modified process of Katoh et al., the catalyst includes at least one noble metal (platinum) selected from the group consisting of platinum, rhodium, palladium and iridium.

Re claim 23, in the modified process of Katoh et al., the exhaust-gas temperature in the second exhaust-gas state (lean air-fuel ratio) ranges from 200°C to 350°C at the inlet of the catalyst.

Re claim 24, in the modified process of Katoh et al., the catalyst includes platinum and rhodium as the noble metal (see lines 65-66 of column 3).

Re claim 25, in the modified process of Katoh et al., the catalyst includes at least one of a cerium-oxide powder and a zirconium-oxide powder (see Table 2 and lines 50-62 of column 4 in Ozawa et al.).

Art Unit: 3748

Response to Arguments

Page 6

4. Applicant's arguments with respect to the reference applied in the previous Office Action

have been fully considered but they are moot in view of the new ground(s) or rejection.

Communication

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Examiner Tu Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 272-

4862.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Mr. Thomas E. Denion, can be reached on (571) 272-4859. The fax phone number

for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

TMN

October 29, 2007

Tu M. Nguyen

Primary Examiner

Tu M. Nguyen

Art Unit 3748